

The Lawyer as an Artist.

ADDRESS BEFORE THE WOMEN LAWYERS' CLUB OF NEW
YORK CITY AT ITS MEETING FEBRUARY 23,
1905, AT THE NATIONAL ARTS CLUB, 37
WEST 34TH STREET, NEW YORK.

BY
WALTER S. LOGAN.

Ex Libris

SEYMOUR DURST

t' Fort nieuw Amsterdam op de Manhatans



FORT NEW AMSTERDAM



(NEW YORK), 1651.

When you leave, please leave this book
Because it has been said
"Ever'thing comes t' him who waits
Except a loaned book."

AVERY ARCHITECTURAL AND FINE ARTS LIBRARY

GIFT OF SEYMOUR B. DURST OLD YORK LIBRARY

016012
RF
292
29
13

THE LAWYER AS AN ARTIST.

Webster defines science as "accumulated and established knowledge." He defines art as "the application of knowledge or power to practical purposes."

J. F. Genung says:

"Science is systematized knowledge; art is knowledge made efficient by skill."

Jurisprudence is the science of the law, its statics.

Its dynamics are in the everyday work of the lawyer who makes efficient by his skill as an artist the knowledge that is found in the jurisprudence. The good lawyer is the man who practices his profession as a live art, the man who accomplishes things.

We have lawyers who devote themselves to jurisprudence, who are very learned in the law; but unless they combine the skill of the artist with the knowledge of the scientist they are not the moving factors in our profession. The opinion of such men even on a pure and simple question of law is sometimes less to be relied on than the opinion of the practical man whose feet touch earth and whose head is far below the sky. I would often rather have a good guess from some lawyers I know who could not quote authorities, but whose nervous systems are well attuned to the practice of the profession, than the labored researches of other lawyers who are fuller of precedents, but who are without the quick practical judgment that characterizes the

man of action. It is, however, comparatively seldom that the lawyer is called upon for a legal opinion on a straight and simple question of law. In practical life the facts and the law get most irretrievably mixed and it takes the artist to sort them out. The scientist may be of use after the sorting has been done, but he is almost helpless if he has to do the sorting. The giving of opinions, however, is a small part of a lawyer's real work. Clients come to us for results, not for opinions. The lawyer that the client seeks and that the community needs is the man who can do things, who can get results, who can save the situation.

They tell a story of the campaign in the Wilderness. One of the commanders had to put his army across a river which could neither be forded nor ferried, so he had to have a bridge. The engineers went to work busily upon the plans, but there was a practical country carpenter in one of the regiments who made his way to headquarters and said: "Gineral, if you want a bridge I kin build you one." The general said: "Go out and see what you can do and report to me at 6 o'clock to-night." At 6 o'clock the country carpenter was there with his report, as follows: "Gineral, that bridge is built and the army is on its way over, but them picters that them other fellers is making ain't done yit." The practical man had put the army across the river while the engineers were designing the bridge. The situations that are to be saved, the triumphs that are to be won, do not always wait for logical sequences. A lawyer who is called up by his client at 10 minutes to 3 in the afternoon for instructions how to close out a hundred thousand dollar trade before 3 o'clock, so as to save his client from loss and prevent a suit for damages, has not much time to examine law books. The real artist of a lawyer at such a moment will firmly grip the rudder and steer his client safely through. The scientist lawyer will logically work out some plan for his client's salvation, perhaps, but too late to save him. The

lawyer artist will win fame and money while the lawyer scientist grows poor.

Here, therefore, to-night, in the galleries of the National Arts Club where we are assembled, I plead the cause of the lawyer as an artist before an audience who were artists before they were lawyers.

The lawyer is, I claim, the highest product of human evolution. The civilization of any nation may be measured by the number of its lawyers. It is not necessary for me to prove in this place and before this audience that the United States is the most civilized nation in the world, and the statistics show that it has twice as many lawyers in proportion to its population as any other country has. England comes next in the degree of its civilization and in the number of its lawyers. France and Germany follow. Russia has more priests and less lawyers in proportion to the population than any other country in Europe, and if you pass over to the Orient, where modern civilization is struggling with ancient barbarism, you have to search far and long before you can find a lawyer of any kind.

There is another reason for the great prevalence of lawyers among the English-speaking peoples of the world. We were the first race to safeguard our liberties by institutions, and it is only where liberty has been so safeguarded that the science of jurisprudence or the art of practising law can flourish. In every country in the world where any other language is spoken the declaration or complaint or petition which is the initiatory proceeding in a lawsuit ends with a *prayer* for judgment. Among our English-speaking commonwealths alone do we conclude with a *demand*. For a long time in England the distinction was made between a declaration at common law and a bill in equity. The common law declaration demanded judgment, the bill in equity prayed for it. The original theory was that at law the suitor was seeking his rights; in equity he was asking

a favor. But the reason and the result have both disappeared. Into a modern equity court the suitor comes now as much as a matter of right as into a court of law, and so, wherever the English language is spoken—with few exceptions which are matters of form only—we conclude our initial equity pleading with a demand for judgment. The English-speaking suitor has no favor to ask when he comes into court. He comes to demand a right. No other race in the world pays such a regard to judicial precedent as we do. I called on a prominent lawyer in the City of Mexico one time. I asked him to show me his library. I would like to look, I said, at the decisions of their Supreme Court. He said: “Mr. Logan, we have no decisions as you understand the word. I can show you a book of sentences—judgments in particular cases—but our courts decide each case upon its particular equities without regard to previous decisions.” If a judge who is in charge of a case thinks that a rule laid down in some other case would not work equity in the case he is trying, or is not to his liking, he disregards it. If he is a just judge he seeks to do justice in that case without regard to any other cases that have ever been decided by any other judge. The theory is a beautiful one, but in practice it is arbitrary in the extreme. It puts the judge above the law. Under our practice the judge is nothing, the court is everything, the law is supreme. Under the Latin practice, which prevails now in most countries which speak some other language than ours, the judge is supreme. He is bound by the law if it is in the form of a statute, but he knows no other law. Precedent is of little importance.

No other race in the world dignifies its lawyers as ours does. With us the lawyer is a part of the court. The court consists of one or more lawyers on one side the bench and all the other lawyers on the other side. It is the duty of the lawyers before the bench to present the facts and

make the arguments. It is the duty of the lawyers behind the bench to decide conflicting points of evidence and determine disputed points of law.

There is now but little difference in dignity between the lawyers on one side of the bench and the other. In England the lawyers on both sides wear wigs and gowns to differentiate them from the rest of the world. In this country we have not adopted the wig, and the gown when worn is confined to the lawyers behind the bench—and to the lady lawyers in front. The logic of the English practice is better than ours. The judge is no more sacred than the advocate. The reason we do not wear the gown before the bar here is, I imagine, because we are in too much of a hurry and do not care to take the time to put it on.

Among all the other races in the world the lawyer is regarded simply as a servant of the court. The initiative is taken by the judge. The examination of witnesses is usually conducted by the judge. Cross-examination is an unpractised art. The lawyer is little more than an attendant of the court to do its bidding. I remember being interested in a case tried in a country where the practice introduced by the Code Napoleon prevailed. When testimony was taken the witness and the judge retired to a closet and the testimony was taken in secret. I asked a lawyer friend of mine what the judge did in the closet. The answer was: "He took evidence." I asked if he took anything else, and the reply was: "Not if he's an honest judge."

All the lawyer can do is to wait outside till the judge gets through with the witness, and then later, when he is given a copy of the testimony, he has the distinguished honor of being allowed to file a brief.

No wonder is it that the lawyer as an artist flourishes only where the tongue of Blackstone is spoken.

The trial is the distinguishing characteristic of our Saxon jurisprudence. There comes a time in the history

of every litigation, if it pursues its natural course, when plaintiff and defendant must be opposed to one another on the firing line in court and the case must be tried. The judge is there to help neither plaintiff nor defendant. He is not there to conduct the trial. That is done by the lawyers. He is there simply to decide disputed questions which arise in the course of the trial and to keep order. Where the lawyers agree the judge has little to do. Where the lawyers differ he decides between them.

It is an atmosphere in which the lawyer as an artist flourishes.

The Saxon suitor has been brought up in the civilization of self-reliance. He has made his own way in the world from the beginning. He has lived under no paternal government. The rain of Heaven has not been showered on him for his virtues or withheld from him for his sins. He has had just what he could win. He is in court just what he is in his everyday life—a man fighting the battles of the world on his own account, asking favors of nobody and seeking not for any privilege, but simply for his rights. In court as out of court all he asks for is a fair field and no favors—an even chance. The lawyer is the representative of the suitor, and he occupies a position of dignity which the lawyer of no other race in the world can approach. Among no other peoples of the world is there a provision in their jurisprudence for the real equivalent of our trial. Among other peoples a lawsuit progresses from its inception to its end, and some result is evolved, but the result is ordinarily reached not by a decisive trial at some point in the history of the litigation, but by a gradual progress from the beginning to the end. Some other countries, it is true, have copied our constitutions and imitated our institutions and have evolved something the apparent equivalent of our trial, but it is a graft upon an uncongenial stock, and while the Saxon form is there it is the Latin spirit that prevails. The

judge is till the dominant figure. The lawyer takes a back seat. The artist has no chance.

The dignity of our profession among our Saxon peoples is due to the fact that in the administration of justice the lawyer does take the principal part. The genius of the artist is called for. The judge is only an incident. The law, with the artist lawyer as its instrument, rules supreme.

Ours is truly a land governed by law. I had some business one time which led me to have an interview with the President of one of the Latin republics of our continent. It related to a railroad that was partly in his country and partly in ours. He asked: "What does your President, Mr. McKinley, think about this matter?" I said: "The courts have decided in our favor. Mr. McKinley himself has probably never heard of it." "What!" he replied, "an important case like this escapes the notice of your President!" It was hard for him to understand that on this side the border, where we speak the English language, the executive had no judicial power or influence. On our side the border it was not what President McKinley thought, but what the courts decided to be the law, that controlled the situation.

Of course it would be unfair to compare our system with that of Russia, where the will of an autocrat is all the law there is. He may lay down rules for his own convenience which he may call the law, but the rules he lays down are binding only so long as he chooses to follow them. In Russia the executive power is everything. There are no courts that are free and independent like ours, and a court that is not free and independent of the executive power is no court at all. The artistic practice of the law in such a country and under such conditions cannot flourish. The lawyer as such cannot be an important factor in the social economy. But on all the Continent of Europe the same conditions prevail, though in a less degree. The Kaiser chafes under his restraints and yearns for a free hand like

his cousin the Czar, though I think the developments of the last few months have somewhat modified his yearnings in that regard. In France, though it is a republic, the courts are more or less under executive influence. No jurisprudence based on the Code Napoleon can be the basis of free courts such as we have. The common law was evolved by a country that loved its liberties. The Code Napoleon was the work of a despot. In England alone of all European countries are the courts free and independent, and in England alone of all the countries of Europe does the lawyer occupy his proper place in the social economy. The first condition of real political freedom is a free judiciary, and it is only under a free judiciary that a great bar can be evolved to practise before it—that the lawyer can be an artist.

To my mind the longest single step that civilization has ever taken was the evolution of the art of cross-examination, and it was the work entirely of our race and our profession. Before that art was evolved a disputed question of fact was usually settled by the method known as the "wager of battle." The plaintiff asserted a fact, the defendant denied it, and then they or their champions took their horses and their spears and fought it out to see who told the truth. There are some things in favor of this method of trial. It was speedy and decisive. The jury never disagreed. The judge never set aside the verdict and judgments were never reversed on appeal, but, notwithstanding, it was not altogether satisfactory. A small man stood a poor chance of having his word taken against a big one unless he could get a champion to fight for him, and champions came high.

Later, when they got to administering oaths in the courts of justice, the plaintiff and defendant each tried to outnumber the other in the matter of witnesses, and seven witnesses always prevailed over six. This was a straightforward and easy method of settling the controversy. The judge or jury had only to count noses. It did not require

great intellectual acumen to decide the case. But still even this was unsatisfactory to our restless ancestors. There arose a race of swearers, and the man who had the most money to pay subpoena fees won his case. Perjury became prevalent, and a state of things came to pass compared with which the swearing off of personal taxes downtown in the Stewart Building every year would be considered an innocent diversion. The name of the lawyer who first essayed to cross-examine a witness to determine whether he was telling the truth or a lie has been lost in the mists of history. It is a pity, for he started the greatest reform that the world has ever known. With that lawyer and on that day the art of practising law really began. Thenceforward and forever there was some test other than that of physical strength or elasticity of conscience by which truth could be determined. The name of the man is unknown. Even the century in which he lived is unknown, although if we should put it in the twelfth or thirteenth century we should not go far wrong; but his race and his country are not unknown. The art of cross-examination was developed by our race among our ancestors on the green isle of Albion. It has evolved from that day to this, and to-day it is the most important art known to our civilization. The services of the lawyer who can cross-examine are sought wherever courts are open, and the great cross-examiner can win more compensation in less time than any other man who works for his bread. I will send my office clerk, if need be, to argue a case in the Court of Appeals, but I will cross-examine the witnesses myself.

The lawyer as an artist first took his place in history with the practice of the art of cross-examination.

There is another characteristic of our profession as practised among the peoples of our race. It is their fidelity. Lawyers in their everyday lives are perhaps not better than other men, though I certainly would not concede superiority

to any other class in the community. They have their weaknesses and their vices. They love money, like other men, and they will sometimes violate the moral and the legal law to get it, but the lawyer is faithful to his client. During the practice of law in this city for a period longer than most of you have lived, coming in contact as I have with many thousand members of our profession, in matters almost numberless, I have never found half a dozen instances where a lawyer abused the trust that his client had confided in him. I have known members of my profession commit about all the other sins there are on the calendar, and do about all the other mean things that could be conceived, but where a client has trusted his case to them they have been faithful to that trust. It is not a peculiarity of great lawyers or of lawyers of unusual moral fibre. The youngest member of the profession just admitted to the bar, or the wickedest lawyer in the town, may be as faithful as the lawyer whose head is crowned with silver and who has won his honors and his fame. There is a degree of fidelity of counsel to client that is not found in any other relationship in life. Husbands betray their wives, children their parents, business men their partners, common men their friends; but where the Saxon race is dominant and the English language is spoken lawyers do not betray their clients. Fidelity to a trust is artistic, and in this as in other respects the lawyer is an artist.

The lawyer is able to put himself in another's place as no other man can. He is, therefore, able to give advice to his client which is generally sane and safe even upon subjects with which he is little familiar. The man who consults his lawyer about an intricate business problem usually gets good advice, and if the lawyer was consulted oftener and his advice followed more closely there would be more uniform business success and fewer great business disasters. The fact is that the lawyer is trained from the beginning

of his practice as no other man in the community is trained, to act for another man. The true lawyer will never complicate himself so that he is unable to look at any question from his client's standpoint. He will of all things avoid having any personal interest in the matter in controversy. He will save himself and all his energies to be used in his client's behalf. Our profession is pre-eminently a profession of trust and confidence, and it is the glory of the profession that that trust and confidence is so seldom misplaced.

The pre-eminently successful lawyer is not, therefore, necessarily the man of pre-eminent learning or the man of ripe and mature judgment upon legal questions. He is the man who can pierce the armor of a lying witness on cross-examination, who can present the facts of his case clearly, succinctly and plausibly, who can advise his client wisely and convincingly and promptly, and can guide him with unerring steps round all the pitfalls of his business life—the lawyer who is the true artist.

Much has been said and written about the limits of the lawyer's profession. I claim for it wide limits. I reject petty limitations. Any work is within the lawyer's sphere that he can do better than anyone else, provided only it is done for some one else. The only limitation I put on our professional activities is that we must always be working for another man. The lawyer must never be personally interested in the result. He must always be a representative, not a principal.

But if his client is on the verge of failure because of bad business methods, it is not unprofessional for him to take the initiative and inaugurate business reforms that will save the situation. If his client needs capital for his business he may properly put him in contact with men who can furnish it and help him get it, only it must not be the lawyer's own money, for then he becomes a business partner and not a lawyer.

If the initiative is to be taken in the organization of something to which the business man is unaccustomed or inadequate, the lawyer may properly take that initiative. He may be president of large corporations and the responsible head of great industrial organizations without losing his professional identity or lowering his professional flag. There are no better railroad presidents in this broad land of ours than those who have been taken from the ranks of our profession, and there are no more honorable lawyers than those who have demonstrated their superior executive capacity in executive positions. There are no safer bank presidents than those who belong to our profession, and many lawyers have shed lustre on it by their achievements in finance. In every position where trust or responsibility has to be imposed by one or many men on another man, the lawyer may properly occupy the position of trust and responsibility. Whenever there is work to be done for others that other men cannot do, the lawyer may properly do it. The lawyer ought to be the most capable man in every community in which he lives, and as the most capable man he must perforce occupy the position of greatest responsibility.

When it comes to practising in the courts he, of course, has no competitor. Justice represents man's highest evolution. Its administration must be in the hands of the best and most capable of men. The approach to the Temple of Justice should be opened wide to suitors, but none must be allowed to assist in its administration except the very best and most worthy.

I claim, therefore, for our profession the primacy among professions. The soldier and the sailor risk their lives in defense of the institutions and flag of their country; but it is the lawyer who formulates and maintains those institutions and makes that flag worth saving. The clergyman preaches from the pulpit the gospel of peace on earth; but it is the practical work of the lawyer that makes that peace

possible. The physician cures the physical ills of humanity; but in these days, when we have found that perhaps the highest work of the Legislature is in enacting a proper sanitary code, the attorney for the Health Board often saves more lives than a hundred doctors. The engineer lays his iron rails under mountains, across plains and over continents; but he cannot put his pick into the ground or lift his first shovelful of earth until the lawyer has got him his right of way. Men of science delve deep into the mysteries of Nature and try to wrest from unwilling Earth the secrets of her processes; but it is the lawyer who defends the patentee and makes the discoveries of men of science valuable to themselves and available to the community. In these days there are other professions coming up every day and on every side, but they all depend for their success upon their abiding faith that the lawyer will maintain existing institutions and protect vested rights.

The crowning triumph of our present civilization is in the successful establishment and maintenance of our existing courts of justice. It is the perfection of these that makes property possible and life worth living. It is the existence of these and the respect paid to them by the community that makes social life and the perpetuation of social institutions practicable. It is to our courts of justice more than to any other institution of modern civilization that we owe all that lifts modern man above the barbarity of his primitive ancestors. All this was the work of the lawyer.

The last step that has been taken in completing the structure of our modern civilization and in bringing to man the full fruition of his untold generations of struggle is the establishment of the International Tribunal of The Hague for the settlement of differences between nations; the substitution of an international court of justice in the place of the marshalling of soldiers upon tented fields,—of the lawyer's brief for the Gatling gun. That step, too, I am proud

to say, was very largely the work of lawyers. I remember with great pride that it was the New York State Bar Association that proposed the first practical plan for an international court. That plan was in the hands of New York's great citizen, Andrew D. White, when he won his great triumph at the Hague Conference, in the establishment of the Hague Tribunal, and it was that plan that was adopted in all its essential features by the Conference and by the nations of the earth that ratified their work.

There is nothing in which progress in modern times is more marked than in the methods of writing history, and modern history is coming to give a lesser place to the soldier and a greater place to the lawyer in the evolution of the world's civilization. Germans are proud of their Von Moltke the soldier, but they are prouder still of Bismarck the Chancellor. Frenchmen honor their Napoleon, but I think they honor him as much for his code—the code of despotism though it be—as for his victories in battle. No one would ever ask the men of Holland to place any name out of the multitude of great names in their proud history above that of William the Silent. But we in this day and generation are coming to give them a double crown of glory, and to place side by side with that of the Prince of Orange the name of their own great Hugo Grotius.

Englishmen celebrate the destruction of the Armada and the victories of Blenheim and Waterloo and Trafalgar, but they celebrate with equal enthusiasm the occurrence on that green isle of Runnymede, where one afternoon the barons wrested from the unwilling hands of King John the Great Charter of Anglican liberty, and they celebrate, too, the memory of those brave and learned men in Parliament and out of it who gave to England and to us their Bill of Rights. They celebrate the memory of John Hampden, who refused to pay ship money, even more than that of Oliver Cromwell, who won the battle of Naseby. They write in letters of

ever-living light the name of their William of Orange, the great grandson of a great grandfather, but they celebrate his memory not so much because he hurled back the legions of Louis of France as because of what he did to found on its present enduring basis the everlasting structure of their and our free institutions. The victory won by their Lord Grey in the passage of the Reform Bill was greater than that won by Wellington at Waterloo. Englishmen honor Wilberforce as much as they honor Nelson, and no soldier or sailor of modern times has ever occupied a place in their hearts equal to that occupied by John Bright and William Ewart Gladstone.

We Americans honor the great name of our own great Washington, but history is now writing Washington at his greatest and his best not as commander of the forces of the Revolutionary War, but as Chairman of the Constitutional Convention of 1789, and as first President of the United States. Alexander Hamilton, side by side with Lafayette, stormed the forts at Yorktown, but we have almost forgotten that brave and brilliant exploit in our memory of what he did in establishing upon a firm and enduring foundation the Government of the United States. All over the land we rear monuments to the memory of Greene, and Putnam, and Sullivan, and Morgan, and Wayne, and other heroes of the Revolution, but we are now coming to recognize that John Marshall, the lawyer, did more to make the American nation than all of them.

Half the nation celebrates with loud enthusiasm the memory of Andrew Jackson, and the other half celebrates it too, only a little more quietly; but it is Andrew Jackson, author of the Nullification proclamation, rather than Andrew Jackson, the victor at New Orleans, whose memory we most honor.

When we write the history of our Civil War we cover with glory the names of Grant, and Sherman, and Sheridan,

and Farragut, and other soldiers and sailors; but towering way above them all stands the sublime figure of Abraham Lincoln, the lawyer.

A few years ago we were welcoming home the heroes of the Spanish War. We showered our honors upon Dewey, and Sampson, and Schley, and Merritt, and Shafter, and Joe Wheeler, and Roosevelt; but while we have been honoring all these men—our soldiers and our sailors—with well-deserved honors, we have never forgotten what we owed to the cool head and steady hand of the Supreme Commander-in-Chief through that war of the Army and Navy of the United States—William McKinley, the lawyer. Nor have we forgotten that the practical results of the war were obtained for our nation very largely by the lawyer members of the Peace Commission in Paris and by the labors of William H. Taft—lawyer and judge—in the Philippines. The best Secretary of the Navy we ever had was Benjamin F. Tracy, a lawyer. The best Secretary of War, Elihu Root, another lawyer. And they are both better lawyers to-day than they were before they were at the head of the army and navy departments of the United States.

I have thus far spoken of lawyers in the masculine gender. If I had so spoken as of the time when I commenced the practice of the law here in New York I should not need to make any explanation. When I came to the bar I do not remember that there was a woman lawyer in all the world. Now we find women lawyers in the courts of almost all the States of the American Union. It used to be thought a good joke to consult a woman lawyer, but a great many of us have found it was something more than a joke to have one retained upon the other side of the case.

There is a story told of a dusky queen on some island in the South Pacific not ten thousand miles from that Manila Bay where Dewey one Sunday morning planted the Stars and Stripes seven thousand miles farther west than it had

ever been planted before. This queen had in some way acquired a greater knowledge and insight into things than her subjects, and she viewed with disfavor the superstition that she saw around her. One day she called her subjects together and she said to them: " You think that yonder burning mountain is a god. It is not. That is simply common ordinary fire, just like the fire which you put under your kettles when you cook your dinners, only there is more of it. It is a volcano, a natural phenomenon. Do you not believe me? Come and see!" And they followed her to the foot of the mountain, and they saw her climb its craggy summit, and they heard her revile the god that they supposed to be within, and they saw her pick up sticks and stones and throw them into the crater in derision, and they saw her pull her slipper from her dusky foot and throw it in, and they heard her say: " If you be really a god, come forth and avenge the insult!" But the mountain burned on and harmed her not, and she led her people back, and the superstition that the burning mountain was a god was gone forever.

A generation or so ago some other women, fairer than my dusky queen, but with the same proud spirit, said to their sisters: " The idea that prevails throughout the world that a woman must not work; that she must have no ambitions; that she must be contented to follow in man's path and do his bidding, is all wrong. Do you not believe us? We will show you. We will go down into the marts of trade and we will win business success equal to that of our brothers. We will go into the professions and we will win a place on an even footing with them there and gain equal honors and equal fame. We will go everywhere that man goes and do everything that he does, and be successful as he is successful, doing our full share of the world's work and bearing our full share of the world's burdens, and then we will go back to our parlors and be the loveliest women

in the land." And they did it. And the superstition that woman to be lovely must be useless is gone forever.

Among the professions which she chose was, fortunately, our profession of the law, and every year more and more women are coming to practise in the courts of the American nation, and to do their duty as lawyers in the community, and every year their influence is being felt in these courts and in the community more and more for civilization, for humanity and for righteousness, and now when, here in this great city of New York, I find such a flourishing Women Lawyers' Club as is meeting here to-night, I feel that the future of the land I love so well is better assured than ever before, and that the prosperity and happiness of the American people has a broader foundation now that its basis is laid upon the ability and energy of both sexes instead of one of them—now that the foundation is as broad as the structure that is reared upon it.

I am a little late in doing it, but it is my first opportunity. Women lawyers of New York, I bid you welcome to the profession that you have already so well begun to adorn.

Women have already been at the bar in this State long enough to enable us to see the fulfillment of good things and the promise of better. I happen to know that Mrs. Fannie H. Carpenter has taken important cases through to the Court of Appeals and won victory and fame in doing so. She is a lawyer that is an artist.

I happen to know something also of the work which the Legal Aid Society has done during the last eight years. Charitable organizations generally I think are apt to do as much harm as good, but the Legal Aid Society is different. It does not dole out charity; it helps people to assert and maintain their rights. It does not destroy the self-respect of those whom it helps; it increases it. It has been a most potent force in this community for the righting of wrong and the prevention of oppression. I know of no one better

deserving the gratitude of this community than Mrs. Rosalie Loew Whitney for the professional work that she has done in connection with the Legal Aid Society. She, too, is a lawyer that is an artist.

